4

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,112	06/27/2001	Philip M. Walker	10005039-1	4872

7590 06/01/2007

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
DOAN, DUYEN MY	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2152	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
06/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/893,112	WALKER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Duyen M. Doan	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 January 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *21 February 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the submission filed on 1/19/2007. Claims 1-19 are presented for examination.

Response to argument

In view of the Appeal filed on 1/19/2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. The new rejection set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3,6-9,11-14,16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ebata et al (us pat 6,708,209) (hereinafter Ebata).

As regarding claim 1, Ebata discloses providing a graphical user interface (GUI) to an operator with which client connectivity with the resource on the local network can be enabled, the GUI being configured such that the process used by the operator to facilitate connectivity using the GUI is the same regardless of a configuration of the remote client network (see Ebata col.3, lines 27-45; col.4, lines 1-25; col.5, lines 14-28; col.12, lines 46-67, administrator uses a GUI to allow client of one network to access resources of another network); receiving commands of the operator with the GUI that convey the identity of the client and the resource to be accessed by the client (see Ebata col.4, lines 1-25, describe the name of the user, or the IP address of the user's computer); automatically determining the client network configuration (see Ebata col.5, lines 1-28; col.6, lines 35-62, the resource policy table); and automatically establishing client connectivity to the resource so as to provide the client on the remote client network access to the resource on the local network(see Ebata col.14, lines 44-65).

As regarding claim 2, Ebata discloses wherein the GUI comprises lists of clients and available resources (see Ebata col.3, lines 27-45; col.4, lines 1-25; col.5, lines 14-28; col.12, lines 46-67).

As regarding claims 3, Ebata discloses wherein receiving commands comprises first receiving selection of a client for which connectivity is to be provided (see Ebata col.3, lines 27-45; col.4, lines 1-25; col.5, lines 14-28; col.12, lines 46-67).

As regarding claims 6, Ebata discloses wherein determining the client network configuration comprises accessing a connectivity database that stores the client network configuration (see Ebata col.6, lines 35-63; col.12, lines 46-67, resource policy table has information about the client in the organization allow to access resource of other organization).

As regarding claims 7-9,11, the limitations of claims 7-9,11 are similar to limitations of rejected claims 1-3,6, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claims 1-3, 6.

As regarding claims 12-14,16, the limitations of claims 12-14,16 are similar to limitations of rejected claims 1-3,6, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claims 1-3, 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4,10,15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebata (us pat 6,708,209) in view of Iijima et al (us pat 2,223,218) (hereinafter Iijima).

As regarding claim 4, Ebata discloses the invention substantially as claimed in claim 3 above, Ebata does not implicitly disclose a client VLAN.

Iijima teaches a method of configuring client VLAN (see Iijima col.1, lines 47-64).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Iijima to the method of Ebata to include a VLAN, because VLAN has advantage of being able to reduce unnecessary traffic and ensure security (see Iijima col.1, lines 24-30).

As regarding claim 10, Ebata discloses the invention substantially as claimed in claim 9 above, Ebata does not implicitly disclose a client VLAN.

Iijima teaches a method of configuring client VLAN (see Iijima col.1, lines 47-64).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Iijima to the method of Ebata to include

a VLAN, because VLAN has advantage of being able to reduce unnecessary traffic and ensure security (see Iijima col.1, lines 24-30).

As regarding claim 15, Ebata discloses the invention substantially as claimed in claim 14 above, Ebata does not implicitly disclose a client VLAN.

Iijima teaches a method of configuring client VLAN (see Iijima col.1, lines 47-64).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Iijima to the method of Ebata to include a VLAN, because VLAN has advantage of being able to reduce unnecessary traffic and ensure security (see Iijima col.1, lines 24-30).

Claims 5,17-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebata (us pat 6,708,209) in view of Iijima et al (us pat 2,223,218) (hereinafter Iijima) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of McNally et al (us pat 6,259,448) (hereinafter McNally).

As regarding claim 5, Ebata and Iijima discloses the invention substantially as claimed in claim 4 above, however the combination of Ebata-Iijima does not disclose the concept drag and drop in GUI.

McNally teaches the concept of implement the drag and drop protocol in a graphical user interface (see McNally col.2, lines 9-21).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of McNally to the method of Ebata-Iijima to implement drag and drop protocol in a GUI, because by dragging and dropping would reduce the work of administrator and minimize the number of actions required by the administrator (see McNally col.2, 1-40).

As regarding claim 17, Ebata discloses using the GUI to identifies resources on a local network that are available for use by client on remote client network (see Ebata col.3, lines 27-45; col.4, lines 1-25; col.5, lines 14-28; col.12, lines 46-67).

Ebata does not disclose using a GUI to create new VLANs and identifies VLANs that have already been created; using drag and drop action in the GUI to allocate resources to the VLANs.

Iijima teaches using a GUI to create and configure the VLANs (see Iijima col.19, lines 62-67 to col.20, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Iijima to the method of Ebata to include a VLAN, because VLAN has advantage of being able to reduce unnecessary traffic and ensure security (see Iijima col.1, lines 24-30).

The combination of Ebata-Iijima does not disclose the concept drag and drop in GUI.

McNally teaches the concept of implement the drag and drop protocol in a graphical user interface (see McNally col.2, lines 9-21).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of McNally to the method of Ebata-Iijima to implement drag and drop protocol in a GUI, because by dragging and dropping would reduce the work of administrator and minimize the number of actions required by the administrator (see McNally col.2, 1-40).

As regarding claim 18, Ebata-Iijima-McNally discloses wherein the first window includes a VLANs subwindow that identifies clients and a resource subwindow that identifies resources associated with the clients identified in the VLANs subwindow (see Ebata col.3, lines 27-45; col.4, lines 1-25; col.5, lines 14-28; col.12, lines 46-67; also see Iijima col.19, lines 62-67 to col.20, lines 1-10). The same motivation was utilized in claim 17 applied equally well to claim 18.

As regarding claim 19, Ebata-Iijima-McNally discloses dragging and dropping further causes automatic establishment of client connectivity to the resource so as to provide the client on the remote client network access to the resource on the local network (see McNally col.2, 1-40; also see Hsieh pg.3, par 12-13; pg.6, par 50-52; pg.7, par 53-54, par 56-59; pg.8, par 60-62). The same motivation was utilized in claim 17 applied equally well to claim 19.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duyen M. Doan whose telephone number is (571) 272-4226. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Examiner
Duyen Doan
Art unit 2152

5/29/07
BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER